

E 416

.B87

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005024742









1  
SPEECH

P. 354, 16  
OF

✓  
CHARLES BROWN, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

ON

ABOLITION AND SLAVERY:

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 3 AND 7, 1849.



25/10  
3-3-49

---

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.

1849.

E416  
.B87

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT



## ABOLITION AND SLAVERY.

In reply to Mr. THOMPSON, of Indiana, on Abolition and Slavery.

Mr. BROWN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Ever since I have been in active political life, beginning twenty years back, before the people of Pennsylvania, in her halls of legislation, and in the convention that amended her constitution, have I spoken as I speak this day, against this whole abolition agitation, here or in the free States. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, I have given silent votes against every proposition that has been brought into it in any way calculated to interfere with the subject of slavery, here or in the slave States, knowing that its agitation could do no good, and was doing much harm. And I would have continued the same quiet course for the brief space of time I have yet to remain here—looking to the future to approve my course, as my constituents have heretofore approved all that I have said and done upon the subject—but for the remarkable speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. THOMPSON]—a speech which struck me, as I think it must have struck this House, with surprise and astonishment.

The gentleman told us, that upon this subject he belonged to the great conservative party of the Union—the party opposed to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the States, or its agitation in any place where it might have the tendency to disturb the peace and harmony of the country, or endanger the perpetuity of our Union. He not only asserted his own conservatism, but vouched for the conservatism of the people of the State which he in part represents; and, still further, vouched for and boasted of the conservatism of the late venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. J. Q. Adams,] who, but a few months since, fell among us. Now, I ask, were not these startling assertions? To me they were. I remember well when I met that gentleman [Mr. THOMPSON] on this floor some seven years ago; he was then truly conservative on this question. I had doubts then as to the propriety of the twenty-first rule, and my colleague [Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL] and myself attempted for days to have it modified, that whatever was objectionable in it might be struck out, and all its conservative character retained. After two or three weeks' trial, we failed to attain our end. We could not amend it, and we voted for it; and from that time to this I have sustained that rule, and opposed the introduction of the subject of slavery in any shape. Then the gentleman was with us, in laying upon the table all abolition questions. Then he was a conservative, and rebuked the agitating spirit of abolitionism here. But when

I again met him on this floor at the commencement of the present Congress, how stood the matter? There is the record. Upon every question of the introduction of petitions, during the last session of Congress, relative to slavery in the District of Columbia, the gentleman who, in his speech, so sternly rebukes these movements as calculated to dismember the Union, or to disturb its harmony, voted upon the yeas and nays to bring them into this Hall, and against laying them on the table.

Nay more. When the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GIDDINGS,] at the last session, introduced resolutions concerning a slave who had been maltreated at some hotel in this city—a subject well calculated to agitate and irritate the feelings of southern members—did not the gentleman from Indiana again vote against laying the resolutions on the table, desiring to have them agitated by the House? How changed was the gentleman last session from the time when he stood beside me, six years ago, voting to censure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GIDDINGS] for introducing resolutions calculated to excite the country, and to create unhappy feelings. He who then stood with me to censure and expel from this Hall the gentleman from Ohio, is now found voting with him.

On the territorial question the gentleman's acts have been equally as much at variance with his speech. He says:

“Before he would endanger the union of these States by the determination of any question which might arise in the settlement of the controversy between the North and the South, in reference to New Mexico and California, he would vote deliberately in his place to give it all back, gold mines and all.”

And yet we find by the record he has voted for the Wilmot proviso whenever it has been offered, and against both of the bills that were passed by the Senate as compromises to settle this question without endangering the Union. In his speech he says:

“The discussion of the Missouri compromise, and the admission of that State into the Union, shook this Union to its very centre; the spirit of fanaticism and of faction well nigh worked the dissolution of that glorious Union, under whose preservation our rights had been so long guaranteed and maintained. But conciliation, compromise, and concession, again prevailed, and the Union and its integrity were safe.”

Patriotic sentiments! But then, while my friend from Indiana eulogizes the men who fixed the line of 36° 30' as patriots deserving the lasting honor of the country, he did not vote the other day for 36° 30'; he did not follow in the footsteps of those men whom he eulogized—he voted against it.

I heard the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. THOMPSON] (for he is always

eloquent) with great pleasure, and I only regret that his acts have not corresponded with his words. I regret that he gives to the friends of his youth and the harmony of the Union his *speech* only, and to the enemies of both all his *votes*.

Nor is he more consistent in his eulogy of Mr. Adams. Will any man in this House believe that Mr. Adams stood as a bulwark against the encroachments of abolition feeling in this country? I ask the friends of that departed man, if the gentleman from Indiana does honor to his name or fame in making him the stumbling-block in the way of "fanatical abolition," in making him "stay its progress, although it required the strength of a giant to arrest it," and "rebuke the incendiary spirit which would have sundered every link of the beautiful cycle of our Union?"

I know Mr. Adams did say what the gentleman asserts, that he was opposed to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia then; but I appeal to the memory of that man, if, while he said this, he did not on every occasion, and under all circumstances, through his "scathing eloquence" and votes, give his powerful aid to roll on, no matter who might be crushed by it, the ball of abolition agitation.

Nor has my friend from Indiana placed his own constituents, or the people of Indiana, in any truer position than he has Mr. Adams, or occupies himself. I have before me the proceedings of a late Whig convention in Indiana—but just gone by—scarcely cold. The paper that conveys the intelligence to the country of the conservatism of the Whigs of Indiana is scarcely dry. The resolutions of the convention, like the speech of the gentleman from Indiana, are full of high-sounding phrases of fraternal regard for the South, eloquent in their tone, but containing poison within them; like Joab with Amasa, with one hand they embrace the South to kiss them, saying, "Is it well with thee, my brother?" whilst in the other hand they hold the dagger with which they stab them to the heart. I will read these resolutions, because they may be new to many in this House who heard the speech of my friend the other day:

*Resolved*, That the Whig party of Indiana, here represented in convention, would calmly but firmly express the conviction that the extension of slavery over the newly acquired Territories of New Mexico and California ought to be prohibited by law; that it is our settled opinion that Congress, as the guardian of our infant Territories, possesses that right; that its exercise would be promotive of lasting good to the people who shall inhabit the country included in the late treaty with Mexico; and further, that it is the opinion of this convention that it is expedient to exercise the power at the present session of Congress."

The resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORR] a few days ago, met the special censure of my friend from Indiana, because it spoke of slavery interfering with the progress of human liberty throughout the world. We all know how eloquently the gentleman disclaimed any such imputation upon slavery. I will read his words:

"This resolution asserted that slavery, as it existed in the United States, was 'a serious hindrance to the progress of republican liberty throughout the earth.' Well, he could not, for the life of him, imagine what sort of an abstraction that was; but it was not true."

Here is the response from the Whigs of Indiana:

*Resolved*, That the spirit of the age, and the liberal and enlightened philanthropy which distinguishes its progress, require sacrifices of individual opinion to the great cause of human freedom; that this spirit should be shared by the government and the governed; that MAN, in every condi-

tion, should be reinvested with his rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that it is the anxious desire of the people here represented, that all constitutional and proper means should be employed to free our national capital from the last vestige of human bondage."

These conservative Whigs of Indiana overlooked, in their zeal for the "RIGHTS OF MAN," that negroes in their own State were not invested with any political right—were not allowed their oaths against white men, though necessary to protect their life or liberty.

These resolutions of the Whigs of Indiana show that they are not as conservative on this subject as the speech of the gentleman represented them—they sympathize more with these fanatical abolitionists he condemns.

In eulogizing Mr. Adams, the gentleman from Indiana took occasion to condemn his son for associating himself with Mr. Van Buren in forming the Free-soil party; thanking his God that, "so far, their course has been stayed by the stern rebuke of the American people;" and says, "neither the Whig nor Democratic parties of the North can in any degree sympathize with the present or ultimate purposes of this fanatical party." Now, what say the Whigs of Indiana? I have before me a leading newspaper, the editor of which was one of the Taylor electors, who, I suppose, speaks with as much knowledge of the subject as the gentleman, and probably is to be regarded as a much better exponent of the opinions of the people there. He says, in speaking of the Free-soil convention which had just assembled:

"We learn, also, that a good deal of difference of opinion existed as to the propriety of attempting to keep up a separate organization, now that the Whigs have put in nomination as good Free-soil men as can be found in the State. A resolution confirming the nominations of Messrs. Embree and Stanfield was offered by John H. Bradley, Esq. \* \* \* He contended that the candidates presented by the Whig party were all that could be asked on the slavery question, and by the proper effort and union they could be elected; whilst there was no possibility of electing the nominees of a third party organization."

And thus concludes:

"The effect of such a course would most probably enable James H. Lane to give the casting vote against the passage of proper instructions to our Senators on the slavery question, and would elect Mr. Wright, whose whole past action proved him to be opposed to any interference on the part of Congress in relation to slavery in our Territories."

Thus this leading Whig editor connects the Whig party, its candidates and measures, with the Free-soil party and its measures, and says, that unless the latter should adopt the Whig candidates, the only effect would be to cause the election of Democratic candidates who are opposed to the interference of Congress on the subject of slavery. Is that the conservatism of Indiana? Is that the conservatism of the gentleman himself?—to aid in the election of men who are known to be in favor of free soil, and of the agitation of the subject of abolition, and to defeat men who would carry out the objects which he asserts on this floor he and the people of Indiana would sustain? The arguments used by this Whig editor to get the votes of the Free-soil party of Indiana for the Whig candidates are just such as were used everywhere in the North previous to the late Presidential election, and which, in Pennsylvania, unfortunately were but too successful.

But I rejoice at one thing in the gentleman's speech. It will be found in the following passage:

"He wished it were true—he wished he could say it was true, that this, Hall of legislation had as much of that calm,



deliberate conservatism as existed in the minds of the great body of the American people. But there was often to be found a difference between the representative and his constituent: while the constituent, at home, was steadily, calmly, coolly, and earnestly looking and praying for the preservation of the welfare of the Government, *they in this Hall, too often prompted by considerations of faction and party, were disturbing the peace and repose of the Union, and were agitating and exciting for their own sinister ends and selfish purposes.* There was coming a time, he believed—and he thanked God it was so—when *they should come out from the Federal Executive of this Union this spirit of popular conservatism, and it should be poured like oil upon the waters of party;* when, in the settlement of great national questions, they should neither know the name of Whig nor Democrat, but should be prompted by those high, holy, elevated considerations which alone existed in the heart of the true American patriot, whose every pulsation beats for the integrity of the Union of these States.”

It may be there are those in this House and out of it, whose minds are undergoing, or have undergone changes on this subject, as well as that of the gentleman from Indiana; and it may be they see, in the incoming Executive, “a spirit of popular conservatism, that is to be poured, like oil, upon the waters of party;” that they see, in that incumbent of the Executive chair, a man who has not only lived half his life, but the whole of it, in the South; and that to these indications of coming Executive influence may be attributed their “conservative” change—a change that will prove alike favorable to their country and their own future prospects. If so, if favors are to be won by the conservative principles so eloquently expressed by my friend from Indiana, I, for one, shall regret to the last day of my life that I opposed the election of an Executive who would exercise so great and glorious an influence over the destinies of this country. I would fain hope that the omen is true, and that those who fear that the new Executive will not be prompted by those high, holy, elevated considerations, will be found to be in error. I would fain hope that we shall have peace and harmony again; that we shall be as a band of brothers; that we shall meet in this Hall, and everywhere throughout the country, as our fathers met in the days of the Revolution, or as our predecessors met but a few years ago, and crushed everything that interfered with the peace, harmony, and integrity of the Union.

I know the gentleman from Indiana is a man of discernment, and can see as far into the future as most men—perhaps a little further than many of his associates. The shadows that coming events oft cast before have certainly been penetrated by him, and he sees and feels the sunlight that is soon to shine from the White House—the sun whose beams often warm into being, and control many a man’s acts in this country, as well as his speeches and votes in these Halls. I impute no improper motive to my friend from Indiana. A change has truly come over the spirit of his dream since our last session, or he could not have voted then as he did, and speak now as he does. Had he felt then, when the bitter waters of agitation were spreading themselves far and wide, and reaching the very hearts of every portion of our people, what he speaks now, he would here, in New England, in Indiana, and everywhere else where his mission then led him, have rebuked the unhallowed spirit that rode upon those waters, in the same eloquent language he poured forth in this Hall the other day. Changed he is—but this change is doubtless an honest one. It may be the return of early feelings and associations, the ties of which come back upon

us stronger and stronger, as we grow older—or it may be, and no doubt is, the convictions of a ripper judgment—the triumph of a better patriotism, that rises over all “sinister ends and selfish purposes.” No matter what may be the causes or the motives of the change that has taken place in my friend from Indiana and others, I augur for it great good to the whole people of these United States; and I most sincerely hope that the good work will go on, and that when the new Whig and Democratic no-party Administration comes into power, the political millennium predicted by the gentleman from Indiana shall surely come with it.

For myself, I have opposed this agitation from the first to this time; and I think it behooves us all to look where we stand, and where we are going. As the gentleman from Indiana has justly said, we do not stand where we did. This agitation is leading us onwards and downwards, and no man can predict where it will end. A few years ago, who thought that speeches, such as are now delivered here, from time to time, would ever be heard in this Hall? What would have been thought, in the early days of the Republic, if speeches, such as was delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MANN,] had been heard? Where was the noble son of the South who would have sat and listened to such a speech, or who would not have rebuked it in the face of the country, or left the Hall in a moment?—a speech traducing the South, characterizing its citizens as among the most degraded in the civilized world, and attributing to them all the vices humanity can be guilty of, and closing the catalogue by saying: “Thus, at length, has been produced what may be called the *bovic-knife style of civilization*; and the new west of the South is overrun by it—a spirit of blood which defies all the laws of God and MAN!”

It would not be difficult, in any state or condition of society, to point to many a wrong that evil hearts and bad passions inflict upon their victims—to many a human right violated, and to many a wreck of human happiness they have left upon the shores of life; but are we therefore to conclude that because these do occur that the whole society is wicked and vile, and unworthy a place on God’s footstool? Where can we find a spot on the earth where men dwell together that no wrong nor outrage is committed? Why, sir, if we were to gather from the records of those chronicles of passing events, the newspapers, none but the deepest and foulest crimes that are committed in a single year in a single State or city of this Union—aye, even in that State and city that seems to say to all the world, “I am holier than thou”—I mean the “old Bay State,” and the “cradle of liberty”—and send them forth to the world in the simplest language of truth, stripped of all the burning and damning eloquence of words and images with which the character of the slaveholder and the wrongs of the slave are published to the world by the fanatical abolitionist, who is there in that proud State and city that would not shudder at the fearful exhibition? I know in my own native city and State—the city and State of Penn.—such an array of crimes would be fearful indeed, and would prove that there, as everywhere else,

“Man’s inhumanity to man  
Makes countless thousands mourn.”

What would the gentleman from Massachu-

setts, who was himself at the head of the school-system of that State, and who recently received the thanks of the State for his services, think, if a southern man should rise in his place here, with a long array of crimes committed, day after day, and week after week, and characterize them as evidences of the civilization of New England, or of the effects of the school-system in his own State? What would he think, if a southern gentleman had risen here, and pointed to a recent event—a trial then just completed—of a son of New England for the quadruple crime of seduction, adultery, murder, and arson? I allude to the case of Tirrell. True, though he was guilty of all these crimes, and if they had been perpetrated in the South, a southern jury would have brought him in guilty of all, and he would have expiated his offence on the gallows, yet a Massachusetts judge and jury, through the eloquence of a Massachusetts lawyer, pronounced all these crimes—what? Seduction—adultery—murder—arson? No—*Somnambulism*. New England finds honeyed terms for crimes committed there. But if done in the South—if the evil passions which everywhere exhibit themselves from the pulpit to the lowest alley in the largest city, should have been thus manifested in a southern State, or by a master towards his slave, or the crime committed upon a negro, it would have been blazoned forth in eloquent language, embellished by the painter's and the graver's art, and sent throughout the world as the effect of slavery.

But I have no taste for such criminations and recriminations, and I trust they will be heard no more in these Halls. Nor have I any pleasure in hunting up from the records of criminal courts or calendars the evidences of the wrongs and outrages with which earth is filled, north and south; and no true lover of his country ought to have, upon which to find an indictment against my fellow-countrymen. I would rather cover them from all eyes, and hold up to the gaze of the world the nobler traits and better deeds of the whole American people, and thus elevate our national character abroad, and induce a more christian love and charity for each other, and a more just appreciation of our hallowed Union at home.

The best and surest way of removing this unhappy state of feeling is by voting down every proposition introduced for the mere purpose of agitation. This will never be done while encouragement is given to those who introduce them. I am told by some members who voted against laying on the table the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GIDDINGS] to allow slaves in this District to vote for their own emancipation—to place all persons, black and white, bond and free, on an equality—that they were opposed to this part of it, and would not have voted for the bill with this in it. No matter what else of good might have been in the bill, containing, as it did, this insulting proposition, every friend to the peace and harmony of the Union should have voted it down immediately. Why should members from Connecticut, a State which, a few years since, by a vote of three to one, refused to negroes the right of suffrage—or from Illinois, that not only has refused them all political rights, but refuses to allow them to live upon her soil, entertain for a moment such a monstrous proposition, or desire to have it considered and debated here?

In Pennsylvania we have excluded negroes from

voting, after a solemn adjudication of the subject. Yet some of my colleagues, coming, too, from districts whose votes were almost unanimous in favor of this exclusion, have placed upon the record their votes against the immediate suppression of the consideration of the subject here. My friend from the northern district [Mr. WILMOT] is one of them. When he first offered his proviso to the territorial bill, he repudiated all connection with the Abolitionists; and I know, in a speech which he did me the honor to send me, delivered elsewhere, he said he had no sympathy with the negroes; that all he did was for the white man, for the free laborer of the North. Then (here is the record) he voted to suppress all petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. His vote is not found then to aid this abolition agitation; yet how do we find him voting this session? Why, against laying on the table a bill to allow the negroes, both slave and free, to vote in this District, and for all questions which have arisen for the agitation of the subject of the abolition of slavery. It shows (for I mean nothing unkind to my colleague; I have no unkind feelings towards him) where we are going—like little children, we begin by creeping, then we walk, and then we run. All these attempts, whether successful or unsuccessful, to raise the negro politically or socially to an equality with the white man, by act of Congress, and most of all, to allow slaves to vote in this District, in the midst of slaveholding States, for their own emancipation, are most incendiary in their character, and insulting to the South. In few States have they any political rights, and in still fewer are they in any respect placed on an equality with ourselves. Why should we entertain, then, for a moment, in this House, such a question? May not the people of the South justly say to us, "First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye?"

In the olden time, as the gentleman from Indiana justly says, these abolition agitations were summarily put down in this House. Now, we have little else before us. Day after day, in one shape or another, the negroes have all our consideration: we seem to think of nothing else, we talk of nothing else. All the other business of the country is postponed, or badly done, that we may vilify and abuse each other about slavery. Nor is this the worst aspect of this agitation. This sectional war, carried on here in words, is sent out by every mail—aye, with telegraphic speed—among the people, there to make enemies of those

"Who had else  
Like kindred drops been mingled into one."

There seems to be an inexplicable mystery hanging over all these our doings. The gentleman from Indiana tells us he and his people are conservative on this question; that they do not desire to abolish slavery in this District, or anywhere else; that they do not want to commit any wrong upon the rights, or feelings, or interests of the people of the South, or in any way or in any place agitate the question of abolition. How is it, then, and why is it, their votes here, and their conventions at home, are all with those they denounce as fanatical abolitionists? Nor is the gentleman from Indiana and his people the only ones who pursue this strange course. Many others in this Hall will, when you talk to them privately, avow the

same conservative feelings; yet they vote with the agitators. I think they are doing injustice to themselves, and the great body of the people of the North: I am sure they are to the democratic portion of them. They cannot anywhere desire to keep up a perpetual war against their brothers of the South. Then why should we, their representatives, do it? If all the disturbance is, as some say, made by a few fanatics at the North and South, is it not time for those who are opposed to its continuance to unite, as one man, and banish it from among us? And not only should we banish it hence, but from among our whole people. This is the course I have pursued, and I intend to pursue. During my whole political life have I openly rebuked this disturbing spirit in all the speeches I have made before the people of Pennsylvania, and during all that time I never lost an election. Fanatical abolitionism has but small place among the people of Philadelphia or of Pennsylvania, and would have less, if their representatives would but cease to agitate the question here.

I was not born in the South, as the gentleman from Indiana was, though I lived there—in old Virginia—the greater part of six or seven years. I have no ties of feeling or of interest which bind me to the South; all the associations of my childhood and my riper years, all I possess in property or reputation, belong to the North. It is my own native place—my HOME; but I speak here, as I have spoken there, the sentiments of duty, the dictates of my own heart, what I believe is due to the whole people of the United States, live where they may. It is a feeling which I imbibed from reading the early history of our country—the history of the scenes of the Revolution—the patriotism, the eloquence of the sons of the South and of the North pleading and battling for a common cause, and pouring out their blood on the common fields of the South and of the North, for a common country. And the last pulse of my heart shall cease to beat before I can know anything else than that they are all my brethren—bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; and if the North shall continue these aggressions, and attempt to make war upon the South, northern man as I am, I cannot now tell on which side I would be found. I fear I would be on the side—I do not fear, but I know, I would be on the side of justice and right; and I mean by that, that I would be with the South; for I believe that justice and right is with them, and I prefer to be right with them to being wrong with any others.

In many of the northern States, my own among them, I think we have done wrong in throwing obstacles in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves. I know that some guards are necessary to prevent bad men from taking free negroes out of the State under color of their being slaves; yet in some States, these obstacles almost if not quite nullify the constitutional provision on the subject. In this, we have, in my estimation, violated the Constitution of the United States; or, if we have not violated the strict letter, we have violated every principle of fraternal feeling, and of the spirit of that instrument, in passing laws that interfere with the right of the southern people to reclaim their fugitive slaves when they come among us. The Constitution says they shall be given up; and I hold it to be the duty of every northern State through all its functionaries of Government, to exercise all

its powers to deliver up every fugitive slave that shall be found harbored within its borders; it is the spirit, it is the word of the Constitution; it is the bond of the Constitution.

How can it be otherwise than irritating to the South, and calculated to lessen their respect for the Union, thus to see the provisions of the Constitution set aside and the bond of brotherly love disregarded, all for the purpose of robbing them of that which the law and the Constitution guaranties to them?

I was in Virginia shortly after the Southampton insurrection in 1831. I attended the debates of the Legislature for three weeks, listening to eloquent speeches in favor of the abolition of slavery. Never was there a more able examination of the whole subject, or a more sincere desire manifested to devise some way or means to rid the State of it. The thing was found to be impracticable—impossible. Each and every scheme proposed (and there were many) was found, when fairly and fully considered, to contain worse evils than slavery itself. Emboldened by the attempt of Virginia to do something on the subject, I know that the Abolitionists of the North immediately began to pour their emissaries into the South, and to distribute their books with all the pictured horrors of slavery, to induce the people there, I presume, to go on with the subject of abolition. But what was the consequence? These publications were not guardedly sent to the owners; they thought to do a double work: while they enlightened the owners as to their duty, they sought to enlighten the slaves as to theirs; and they induced the belief in many that they would be right in breaking their bonds, even though it were at the price of the blood of those who owned them.

All these means were resorted to to excite the slave to insurrection, to stir within his heart the spirit of rebellion. Nay, what do we see now all over the country? Read the papers, and you will see that these very abolition agents are now there stealing negroes—not only stirring them up to run away, but it is well known that they are everywhere ready to receive them, and that they have their emissaries in the slave States, inducing the slaves to run away. Now, you who have never lived among the slaveholders, what do you think it is to know that these machinations are at work to stir up a savage feeling of discontent, of rebellion, and of revenge in the breasts of those who surround you? It may be all sport to you. It may be you believe you are doing God service in endeavoring by these means to emancipate the negroes. But have you no feeling for the whites? Are the blacks only your brothers? Is there no other race on this earth or in this country but the negro? How many whites would you sacrifice in the South to abolish slavery? I fear, if some were to answer from their hearts, they must say all, *ALL*, and the victims would be too few, they would say, to expiate the cruelties that have been inflicted upon the slave. This is the feeling I want to have rebuked. I know that women and weak men live in terror. They do not doubt that if let alone, all would go on well; the harmony between the races would not be disturbed; but it is in this continual effort at abolition agitation, it is these emissaries of the northern fanatics, secretly among them, whom they dread—perhaps not dread, but whom they have most to fear.

Nor are the whites the only sufferers. It breaks up all confidence between the races, and often causes injurious suspicions to rest on the slave greatly to his injury, preventing much from being done for the improvement of his condition that would be done if they were allowed to live together in peace and security.

And what is the justification for all this? "Southern encroachments!" The Abolitionists, whenever they attempt to justify any attack upon the South, say, Oh! it is the southern encroachments. Now, I ask them, in all sincerity, to tell me wherein the southern encroachments consist? I have misread the history of this country if they can point me to a single instance where the South has attempted to trample upon the rights of the North, or to interfere with their domestic institutions in any way. When the people of the northern States thought proper to abolish slavery, did their brothers of the South interfere? Did they attempt in any way to say, We entered into this Union all as slave States, and you cannot do away with slavery? No. When the North agreed to abolish slavery and send their slaves to the South, did the South shut their doors and say, You shall not come here? When the North attempted to stop the foreign slave trade, did the South say, No? Did the South say, You are characterizing this trade as piracy, and making us odious, and bringing upon us discredit in the face of the world, and we cannot join with you? I never heard of it. I have always understood that the South united with the North to prohibit the foreign slave trade, and brand it with all its odious characteristics. I have yet to learn that anything has been done in the North on the subject of the abolition of slavery anywhere, abroad or at home, that the South has ever attempted to interfere with or encroach upon our rights.

At the time our Constitution was formed Virginia owned nearly the whole of the territory out of which has since been made the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Her right to it may have been doubted, but we conceded it when we took the gift from her. What did she do? With all her slaves, she said, Take it. You may prohibit slavery there. Instead of encroaching upon us, Virginia, a southern State, made the donation of this magnificent domain to the free people of the North.

Next, we acquired Louisiana. Gentlemen now say, We only ask that there shall be no slavery in New Mexico and California, because those Territories are now free, and it would be encroachments on the rights of the northern man to let the slaveholder go there; but if it was slave territory we would not ask you to abolish slavery there. But when we got Louisiana, and Missouri presented herself for admission into the Union, how stood the case? It was all slave territory. Missouri, as a sovereign State, presented herself to the Union—we threatened, we tried to reject her; but better counsels prevailed, and she was admitted—but one half of all Louisiana was made free.

Then Texas was annexed. I made the first speech at the first meeting held in the State of Pennsylvania in favor of annexation. I loved the lone star. It rose in gloom, but soon shone forth in glory. There is not in the records of history, our own included, a page so eloquent of great achievements—of patience, patriotism, and bravery—of all that true hearts and strong arms could do

or endure in a good cause, as that on which is recorded the brief but glorious transit of the "LONE STAR." It deserved to belong to the great American constellation, and I rejoice it is in it, there to remain forever.

Texas, before it was annexed, was all slave territory. Did we then say as we say now of California and New Mexico: We do not ask to change her institutions; all we want is to have them continue as they are? Did we not take from the South one-half of Texas as we had that of Louisiana? Now, all this looks very much to me as if we had been encroaching upon the South, and not the South upon us. I appeal to the House and the country if all this is not true. And now, after having received as a gift from a slave State the magnificent domain of the Northwest, and taken one-half of Louisiana and Texas, we propose to take all of California and New Mexico, and at the same time cry out against southern encroachments!

But we are told—and it is the strong argument of the agitators—that the institution of slavery produces a political inequality against the North. Why, that is very strange. In any light in which I can view it, I think the political inequality is against the South. What is this political inequality? It is placing representation upon numbers that do not participate in the Government. Look at Rhode Island—until the adoption of the new constitution, no poor man could vote in that State. We know, that at the time of the formation of the Constitution of the Union, a large number of the States required a property qualification for voters, and all those who had no property, and all free negroes, were counted in their full numbers, to give Representatives here, while the slaves of the South were only counted three for every five. I may misapprehend the subject; but it strikes me the political inequality is against the South, and in favor of the North. Abolish slavery to-morrow, and every negro of the three millions in the southern States would be entitled to be counted one in making up the basis of representation in this House, and give them between fourteen and fifteen more members in this House.

I desire to excite no sectional feeling, but to allay it—to show who are right and who are wrong in all this. I speak under the influence of no incumbent of the White House, nor for any district, but to you, the Representatives of the whole American people, and, through you, to the people themselves, that all may know and respect each other's rights and feelings, and live as we ought to do, in brotherly love—emulous only of who shall do the most good to the other, and best promote the peace, the welfare, and the happiness of the whole.

What is the aim and object of all this agitation? Does the North, or any part of it, aim at the immediate and total unprepared emancipation of the slaves of the South? My colleague from the Beaver district [Mr. DICKEY] will say yes! The mileage gentleman from New York [Mr. GREENEY] will say yes! The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GIDDINGS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PALFREY], and perhaps others, will say yes! What next? Is it your intention to agitate on until the negro is placed on an equality in all things, social and political, with the white man? This is demanded by the fanatical abolitionists; and such was the object of the bill introduced the other day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GIDDINGS.]

Such, no doubt, is the aim and object of these agitations.

To me the consequences of such a consummation are fearful—now or any time which I can see in the future; for I can see but a short way—fearful to the white race, and still more fearful to the black. And why should we thus rush on madly to carry out an idea, regardless of consequences? Has slavery in reality been such a curse to the slaves? or has emancipation proved so great a blessing to the free negroes?

Compare the condition of the three millions of slaves now in the United States with the condition of any three millions of negroes in any part of the world, but particularly in those countries in Africa from which they came, and say which is superior. I care not in what the comparison is made—in the development of their mental or bodily faculties. Show me, upon the map, where the three millions dwell who know their God and their Saviour as they know them? Show me the three millions who can and do worship that God as they can and do? Where, in the countries from which they came, are the three millions with minds and intellects so improved and expanded—who know the hundredth or thousandth part of the great workings of the human system as they do? Nor is it in all this only they excel. In the development of physical powers, and the enjoyment of physical comforts, they are no less in advance of their race. Go to any district in the southern States, from the Delaware to the Rio Grande—take the most secluded district, or where the slaves are the hardest worked, worst fed, and most abused, in all that distance, and then go to the land whence they sprung, and take an equal number there from any condition of life, and place them face to face, or hand to hand, in intellectual or personal conflict or comparison, and the superiority of the former would place them as much above the latter as the white race here is above them.

But I am told that slavery is in violation of the laws of God—that it is a great evil, and ought therefore to be immediately extirpated. What the laws of God are upon this subject I do not pretend to know; I am only dealing with *facts*. And will any man tell me where and what is the condition of life that is without its evils? I do not say slavery is a good; I only say it has produced upon the negro race some good, if to improve and christianize so large a mass of mankind be a good.

The Abolitionists rarely or never take so extended a view of this subject as I am doing, but confine themselves to portraying the degradation and the wrongs of the negro slaves, taking always the worst cases—the exceptions to the rule—and painting them in the blackest colors their imaginations can find, and these they contrast with the highest condition of free negro life in the United States or elsewhere, forgetting that even this improved condition of the free negro has itself mainly grown out of slavery. It has been my lot to live a part of some years in the midst of a dense slave population. I speak, therefore, what I know when I say, as a whole, I do not believe out of our own country there is a less worked, better fed, and more affectionately cared for or happier class of laborers in the world. I am sure they do not, on an average, do half as much work in a year as is done in the same period by an equal number of laborers in the northern States. The misery that intem-

perance and want inflict upon the laboring population of many parts of the world, and upon none more than the free negroes in some parts of our own country, is unknown among them. If the laboring population of Europe, aye, even of the best parts of it, had the food and clothing, the dwellings and comforts of home as have ninety-nine hundredths or more of the slaves of our southern States, they would be far better off than they now are.

We of the North do great injustice to our southern brethren on this subject. Much as we may be opposed to slavery, and disposed to eradicate it from among them, let us, at least, do them justice. Condemn slavery as we will, and depict its wrongs as we may, let us neither deny nor conceal what all know, who know the truth—that the great mass of the slaveholders are good masters, and treat their slaves with humanity and kindness.

I am no advocate for slavery, in any shape or place; and no man regrets its existence among us more than I do, or would more sincerely rejoice at its removal, without the infliction of a greater wrong, and with it the entire negro race from our whole land. As it is, it has evils which might and ought to be removed, and of which I intend to speak, as soon as I can get an opportunity, in the language of truth, but in the spirit of kindness, to those who alone have the right and whose duty it is to cure them. At present, my object is briefly to show to those whose disturbing influences are alike injurious to master and slave, their error and their wrong.

Slavery may be an evil—an evil to produce good; for it has pleased God in his wisdom frequently to place nations, as well as individuals, in servitude and bondage, that they may ultimately be redeemed with a greater salvation. When the bondage of the negroes is to end, or what is to be their future destiny, He alone knows, or can accomplish. One thing we do know—that the emancipation, thus far, of individuals among us, or bodies elsewhere, has not been as successful as its philanthropic promoters anticipated. Many individuals of high and pure character when slaves, have become low and vile when freed; and wherever they have established themselves in bodies, they have not improved, but rather deteriorated. For a century or more, there have been schools for their education at the North. Some twenty years ago, the public schools were opened for the negroes in Philadelphia, with which you, Mr. Chairman, are well acquainted; and although we have a number of well educated and highly respectable negroes among us, yet taken in the mass the negro population is no better now than it was then. Where have the free negroes who were educated with the son of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. PALFREY,] gone out into the world and exhibited superior talents, or done anything to elevate their race? Roberts, who is now the Governor of Liberia, and Frederick Douglass, the lion of the Abolitionists—were they not born and raised as slaves? Who is that eloquent divine who is now thrilling the hearts of negroes in Liberia, and whose first sermon was to one of the most enlightened audiences in Alabama? Ellis was born and raised a slave—was a slave when he was received into the ministry, and when he was a proficient in the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin languages. Slavery, if it be an evil, has not been so great an evil to the negro race, so far as we can judge from results,

as to the white race, and to the country in which it exists; and if any one deserves our sympathy, it is the whites.

While they are held as a degraded caste among us, emancipation does not add to their happiness any more than to their mental or moral improvement. I know, in the South, the slaves are more contented in their position and happier than are the free negroes of the North. Few of the slaves ever dream they are equal to their masters; they aspire to no such equality. They are as happy in the best condition of their lot as are the highest and proudest of earth's rulers in the best condition of theirs; nay, more—for they are free from the anxieties and cares that often make the latter miserable. Whilst the free negroes, through the visionary fanaticism of those who believe, or would make them believe, they are equal to the whites, feel their degradation as a wrong inflicted upon them, and made to believe, as they are, that they are entitled to political and social equality, the want of it gives them a thousand times more poignancy of feeling than any slave ever felt for the want of his personal freedom. The history of the world—nay, the history of the last year—shows what men will suffer and do for political equality. It has nothing equal, to prove their longing for mere personal liberty.

Why cannot we leave this whole question of slavery to the care of an overruling Providence, and the people of the States where it exists? To the latter it is left by the Constitution, to regulate or abolish it, as they think best. In one-half of the slave States, if not in three-fourths of them, the majority of the voters, in whose hands this question rests, are not slaveholders. In Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee, the number of non-slaveholding voters over slaveholding is very great; and in most of the States, they hold the political power. Why, then, can we not leave this whole slavery question to them? They have no pecuniary interest in it, and know all about it—know its evils, and can best foresee the effects of its abolition. Think you they have not as much of the milk of human kindness as we who live in the North? The abolitionists themselves say the interest of non-slaveholders in the slave States is opposed to the continuation of slavery. Certain it is, if slavery were as great an evil as it is represented, and its abolition so easy, these non-slaveholding voters would soon remove it from among them. For one, I am willing to leave it to them and their fellow-citizens to take care of. Theirs it is to manage as they please, and with them it is our duty to leave it. Shall we do this, or shall we go on to encourage these fanatical crusaders, who go forth, as of old, under the peaceful banner of the Cross, and with the specious object of doing God service, to desolate and destroy a nation, and perish themselves amid the scenes of strife and bloodshed their own unholy zeal had kindled?

Continued February 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Having been obliged, by the briefness of the time allowed me, when considering the condition of the negroes the other day, to pass over it more rapidly than I desired, I return to it now, for a few moments, to present it more fully to the view of the committee and the country.

\* In an estimate of the capacity of the negroes for self-government, as individuals or communities, many overlook the fact, that even their free, improved condition, such as it is anywhere, has mainly grown out of their previous servitude. I have already alluded to them in relation to individuals and bodies of them in the United States, and now refer to them in, the West Indies, South America, and Liberia, as further illustration of the fact. In Hayti, though they have had the government of the island in their own hands more than fifty years, they have not only not improved their condition in any respect, but have been warring upon each other, on account of their different shades of color, until their best friends fear they will not much longer be able to govern themselves, but must fall under the dominion of the whites again—conquered by adventurers, or by some other nation. They have no men among them now equal to Toussaint L'Ouverture and his fellow slaves, who achieved its independence.

Thus far, the slaves emancipated in the British West Indies have not improved. Many of them have gone back almost into their original African barbarism; and generally they have become indolent, improvident, and vicious; and unless they shall change their course, it will not be many years until the fair islands they inhabit will be as unproductive as they were before the arrival of Columbus, or as any part of Africa.

Of all places on earth where the negroes now dwell, around Liberia the fondest hopes of the friends of the race are gathered. There they have not yet gone back—they are advancing. It is a bright spot in the dark history of that dark people. What it may prove to be in the future, no man knows; but for its success all good men should pray. But while all eyes are turned to it in hope, let none forget that now, with all its intelligence and progress, it is yet only a *colony of liberated slaves* from these United States.

I do not say the negro race is incapable of governing themselves as other civilized nations; but thus far the experiments have not proved very successful. It may be they will yet succeed, or it may be these attempts have been premature; that they have not been through a sufficient number of generations connected with the white race to have that pupillary training required to raise so low and barbarous a race to the proper degree of civilization to enable them to carry on and out that further and continued progress necessary to ultimate success; and this, I think, is the true reason of much of their retrogradation. No one can deny that they are, through climate, physical conformation, or long degradation, an inferior race; not only inferior to the white, but inferior to the American Indians and other races. As such, it may be doubted whether they ever can attain to a sufficiently high standard of civilization to associate with the whites as equals, or as nations to maintain their independence, if left to their own free action. They may lack many of the elements of character necessary to such an attainment. This, however, is what their Maker alone can know—we can only guess at it, from the limited knowledge we possess.

One thing is certain, that no two unequal races can keep distinct, and live together and harmonize as equals. The history of the world is against it. Look at our own history. Two hundred years ago, the whites began to settle this country.

Then, all this vast Union was peopled by a race evidently superior to the negroes. They were free. Everything that religion and philanthropy could devise or do to civilize and christianize this race was done, and yet what has been the result? Millions and millions have been destroyed by us, until the whole race has nearly passed away; and how few have we either christianized or civilized! About the same time we began to civilize and christianize the free Indians, we began to import negroes into this country as slaves. The climate was certainly more favorable to the natives than to the negroes. These negro slaves have not only increased and multiplied beyond all other people, but in civilization and christianity have risen faster and higher, than any and all other barbarous people during the same period. I submit this simple statement of facts to the serious consideration of the fanatical abolitionist, as well as the true philanthropist and Christian. It is full of admonition. To me it proves clearly that an inferior race, or degraded caste, cannot thrive in connection with a superior, unless under its care and control; the former must be made equal to the latter, or be enslaved or destroyed by it. I do not suppose that complete equality (which can only be brought about by a perfect unity or amalgamation of the races) can be desired by any sane member of the European branch of the American family. It is too monstrous to think of, and would lead to such a degeneracy of the whole people of this country as, in a brief period, to cause them to fall before some invading, superior, and purer northern nation or people, in the same way the Indians have fallen, and the mixed breeds south of us must certainly hereafter fall before us.

If the friends of the negroes—fanatical or reasonable—would do the race a real good, they would cease to desire or urge their political or social connection with us, (which, in my estimation, never can, will, or ought to take place,) and direct their efforts to their improvement and removal southward in America or to Africa. The course now being pursued by both fanatical abolitionists and free-soilers, if persevered in, and the more if they shall succeed, will lead, sooner or later, combined with other causes to which I shall shortly allude, and particularly the competition of labor, to a war of races, that must end in the extermination of the weaker.

While the people of the South have rights that should be respected, defended, and protected by the North, and which, for one, I have ever done and intend to do, they have duties to perform, alike required of them by the progressive institutions of freedom and enlightenment in this our own country, by the spirit of the age in which we live, and by their God. As they shall give an account of their stewardship at the great day, they are bound to improve the negroes intrusted to their care, and elevate them to the highest degree of civilization and christianity their situation and condition will admit. They are an inferior race; it is true; but they are not a bad one. They have many valuable and good characteristics, and are endowed with feelings and a soul; and it is due to them, as well as to the white people of the South, that nothing should be left undone that will develop their good qualities and eradicate their bad.

Marriage among them ought to be made and regarded with as much solemnity and obligation as

among whites. They should only marry by consent of their masters, and then never be separated; nor should they be separated from their children while young. I know that these ties of marriage and nature are fully respected by all good masters now, and that their violation is as much condemned by the community generally in the South as in the North. But they should never be violated—they should be made the law of the land as unalterable as those of the Medes and Persians. I am aware, and have already testified to the care and humanity of the masters generally throughout the South; but I know, and we all know, there are bad men among slaveholders as in other conditions of life, and it is to protect the slave from wrong when owned by such men, that every law should be enacted necessary for his improvement and protection. Many good laws are already in existence for the latter purpose, and as I know, are rigidly enforced, far more than the people of the North generally have any idea of. Indeed, the great ignorance of the latter on the whole subject of slavery, is the main cause of all the agitation that has been and is now disturbing the peace of the country.

They should all be educated—taught to read at least—and all good books placed in their hands. I know this was being done to a great extent throughout the southern States before the fanatics began to send their incendiary tracts among them, causing laws to be passed prohibiting education. Those incendiaries ought to be treated as pirates—enemies to all mankind—and effectually put down. Whether they are or not, still I think those laws are wrong. I do not believe education would make them any more likely to be misled by these fanatics than they are without it. Through secret channels and open discussions, one way or another, they are made acquainted with all the doings and designs of these fanatics now, and through ignorance may believe they are for their good; thus creating secret dissatisfaction that cannot be openly met and removed. If they could read, they would know the true condition of their race, and be less likely to be misled. All that I have seen or heard of the effects of education among the slaves has convinced me that it makes them more contented, and more reliable, and more valuable. Indeed, even now, so sensible are many of this fact, that in despite of the laws against it, they deem it their duty to teach their slaves to read. No objections I have ever yet heard, in the eyes of mankind or of God, will be taken as a sufficient reason or excuse for allowing the minds of so large a mass of mankind to remain in comparative darkness forever.

Independently of the high moral tone all this will confer upon the slaves, and the consequent beneficial results to the masters, it will take from the opponents of the institution their most powerful arguments against it. The anathemas of the fanatical abolitionists would be hushed in the approbation of all the rest of mankind.

To cultivate and to christianize so many millions of slaves is an achievement within the power of the South, and will return a hundred fold of good on those who do it. Let the world see these millions of slaves advancing in intelligence and virtue, under the care of their masters, and at the same time all the rest of the race remaining in barbarism, or disturbed and destroyed by their own want of capacity to govern themselves, and slavery will cease

to be the theme for agitation, anywhere and everywhere.

Besides the loss sustained for the want of useful mental cultivation, I know that the people of the South generally suffer much from the want of the proper cultivation of other faculties of their slaves. There is no reason why slaves cannot do as much and as varied work, and as well, as any others, only that they are not trained to the best modes of doing it, and have not placed in their hands the best instruments used in its performance. As a whole, for these reasons they do not perform more than half as much as they might do, with equal ease and more satisfaction to themselves, if they had this physical and mental cultivation. Nor is that half work more than half done, which is a double loss to their masters and to the community. There is no reason why the whole South does not improve in all that embellishes its soil, or renders it more productive, but that its labor is not directed by the intelligence, taste, and energy necessary. The South has all the means requisite to make it the most prosperous and highly beautified portion of the earth, if it would but properly and efficiently develop and direct its means.

I think it is the duty of the South to allow gradual manumission, if not to encourage it. In connection with this, or indeed anterior to it, the South ought to take more effectual steps to improve the free negroes among them. As it is, they are a curse to the whites, to the slaves, and to themselves. They might be made a useful and respectable class, and manumission would then be beneficial to the negro and the whole community, and thus prepare the way for the freedom of the race, without violence or wrong, if Providence ever intends them to be free and remain among us.

I come now to speak of the proposed territorial restriction; that is, to confine slavery within its present limits. Should it be understood at the South that this decree is to be irrevocable, and they submit to it, each of the southern States, looking to its own future prosperity, if not its existence, will do what has been frequently attempted to be done by the fanatics through Congress—stop all immigration of slaves from one State into another. Thus far the slaves have been gradually immigrating southward. At the declaration of our independence, every State in the Union held slaves. New England had as many as Georgia, and so had New York. Even in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, together, the slaves outnumbered those of Georgia. Since then, in the short period of a little over seventy years, all the slaves from the seven old northern States have gone southward into the old southern States, and, with their progeny and the progeny of others of the southern States, have gone and are going on in the same direction, into Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas. Slavery was not abolished in the northern States so much from feelings of philanthropy as from interest. It was found, as foreign white immigration increased, to be less profitable to work slaves than to sell them to the South and employ white labor. The same causes are steadily and increasingly at work now to banish slavery from Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia; a considerable portion of each of these States now employ white labor, and have comparatively few

slaves. As foreign emigration increases, (and increase it will to millions a year,) this removal of the slaves will be continued with a corresponding increased celerity, until slavery, and, to a great extent, the whole negro race in this country, will be confined to the range of country stretching from the Chesapeake all around the coast of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, and inwards to within a few miles of the lower falls of the rivers. This is the great cotton, rice, and sugar-growing country, where negroes can do field work and live and thrive, and where white men cannot work in the fields and retain health and life long. If we do not stop this operation of the wise laws of Providence, the two races will go on to find and enjoy those portions of the earth best suited to each. The negroes, either free or as slaves, will be the laborers to produce cotton, rice, sugar, and other field productions of the South; and the whites who labor will occupy the higher and more healthy portions of the country, and be the producers of breadstuffs, and carry on all or most of the manufacturing and mechanic arts. Should we, however, restrict the slaves and negroes to where they now are, and the more southern slave States prohibit them from coming from the more northern, they will begin in the latter, from which they are now disappearing, to increase in numbers, (unless means are provided to take them out of the country, or they shall be driven into the sea,) and will go on increasing, until they soon drive out all the white laborers, mechanics, and workmen from these States, and throw them back on the northern free States. One-fourth of the people of Delaware, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and nearly one-third of those of Maryland, and two-fifths of those of Virginia, are negroes. Has any man in the North contemplated what must be the effect on the States north of these States of penning the negroes all up where they are? They are a rapidly-increasing race; and should our humanity remain superior to our interest, and we continue to allow them to come among us, they will, instead of sending the surplus South, as they now do, roll back year after year upon us, the worst part of both slave and free, until they drive all the white laborers out of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and northward. This will not be submitted to patiently by the white laborers of the North; and, before they yield to them, many and bloody will be the contests that must inevitably take place. If ever the two races shall become engaged in bloody strife for any object, and most of all for *bread*, it will have but one end—the extirpation of the negroes. We of Philadelphia have had some experience of such a conflict of races; and we of Pennsylvania will be the soonest and most overrun by these returning hordes of negroes.

To the more northern States, this view of the subject will present little or no danger. Their climate is too cold to induce many negroes to go there, and consequently they know very little practically about them—little as free, and less as slaves. But suppose our interest shall prove stronger than our humanity, and we follow the example of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, who impose penalties on all negroes coming into them, and by the last State they are kept out entirely by constitutional prohibition—suppose we do this, what then will be the consequences on the North?

As the negroes increase, the white operatives in



these States will diminish, until the former will have taken the place of the latter in all the industrial pursuits. The advocates of the free white laborers of the North forget that there are hundreds of thousands of the free white mechanics of the North now living and prospering in the southern States. Every town and city is filled with them. In many of them they hold the political power. Besides the mechanics that are there, others are going there continually. Those that are there must go away, or at least no others need go there, if this restrictive system shall be established, for their places will be filled by negroes. As soon as the negroes increase to over supply the demands for their usual out-door pursuits, their owners will of necessity find employment for them in-doors; first in the ruder mechanic and manufacturing arts, and then the more refined, until they will absorb them all.

Still they will go on to increase, and when they have filled all the known avenues of labor, then they will begin to seek new ones; and instead of being, as they now are, the great consumers of the products of the mechanics and manufacturers of the North, they will become their rivals, and then supersede them in the markets of the world. Maryland, Virginia, and indeed nearly all the southern States, have within them rich mineral deposits of coal and iron, and other metals; and their rivers have most magnificent sites for water power open all the year. Inferior as the negroes are, they are nevertheless well qualified for operatives in manufactories. Already in Virginia, and in other southern States, many cotton manufactories are in successful operation, worked by slaves.

Still they will increase, and cannot go out; and as they increase in number, the wages of their labor will decrease, and thus will we cause to grow up in our midst a body of worse than pauper laborers, against whom no tariff or other laws can afford protection. If this slavery-restriction system shall be fully carried into effect, as the Free-soil party contemplate, before one hundred years, or it may be fifty, the manufactories of New England and Pennsylvania, and her iron works too, will be superseded by those on the mountains and rivers between the Chesapeake and the Rio Grande, as certain as the sun shall continue to shine.

Take a more limited view of the effect this restrictive system will have on the trade between the two sections—a trade that has gone on increasing with every expansion of territory to the South until it far exceeds all the rest of the trade of the country. Go to the wharves of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and other seaports of the North, and look at the cargoes of the hundred ships and other vessels there daily, and almost hourly, sailing for some southern port, with all the products of the skill and labor of our workmen. Look, too, at the rich and valuable cargoes of rice, cotton, and sugar they bring us back in return, or take to other countries and bring in return for them to us the products or the merchandise of those countries. All this natural and useful trade and intercourse must be broken up, and those whose bread and comfortable existence depends upon it in the North be driven to unknown parts or pursuits.

There is a great deception in the cry raised for "free soil for free men." I have already said, large numbers of mechanics, artisans, and others of the freemen of the North are now in the South,

and are constantly going there, all of whom find profitable and respectable employment.

If we take into consideration, in addition to the freemen of the North who thus find employment in the slave territory, the vast number of them who find it at home, in providing for the wants of the slave States, I question if the extension of slave territory has not done more for the free workmen of the North than has a like extension of free territory in this or any other country.

I think it is a great mistake to suppose, that to extend the area of slavery is to increase the number of slaves. This is not true while all foreign importation is prohibited. I do not think negroes multiply any faster when scattered over a large surface. The idea that is frequently expressed by some of the most visionary of the fanatics, that their increase is promoted through cupidity, is, to my mind, too absurd to need refutation. The migration of the slaves southward, and their retention in field labor has been a great blessing to them. They are far better off now in the new States of the South, than they would be if they had been confined to the old ones. Think you, if the three millions were confined now within the six old slave States, their condition or the condition of the whites, north or south, would be better than it is? Yet such would be the state of things, if the ideas of those who are opposed to the enlargement of the area of slavery had been adopted fifty years ago; and something like it, or worse, it will be fifty years hence, if they are adopted now, as I have attempted to show.

If such will be some of the effects of this restrictive system upon the North, what will be those upon the South? It is a fearful thought. The very idea of building such a wall around any people to shut them in where they are, and out of all other parts of the earth, is to my mind, in any aspect of the case, most unnatural and horrible. What if the white people of Ireland, or England, or even New England had been thus shut in, can any one imagine what would have been their present condition? And yet we would shut in these three millions and upwards of negroes, with less than double that number of whites, and with the certainty that they would soon be further closed within narrower limits, and with less than an equal number of whites.

I will not attempt to foreshadow what will eventually be the consequence and the end of such a measure to them all. History affords no example to judge from. The world has never yet witnessed so stupendous an act of despotic power and wrong committed by one portion of the people of a country on another as we are, step by step, inflicting on the South, in prohibiting slaves from going south by act of Congress, and then prohibiting all free negroes from going north by acts of the States. True, though the negro may not go out either bond or free, the white man may; but before he is entirely banished from his home, and the home of his fathers, fearful indeed will be the conflict and the suffering to him, and still more fearful to the negroes who must still remain behind him.

What should we do, then, with this great question? for great it is, and of absorbing interest to the philanthropist and the statesman. I cannot say, with my colleague, [Mr. WILMOT,] that "I have no sympathy for the negro," for I have a deep and abiding sympathy for him, and would

do all that can be done consistent with what is due to our own race for his welfare and elevation. I would, looking to his good, recommend no general system of emancipation until he shall have proved himself, beyond all doubt, fit to be free. I would wait till it is seen what his freedom will do for him in this country, in the West Indies, and in Africa. If ever he is to rise in the scale of humanity, it must be in that clime where he is physically best fitted to live in. He never can rise in northern countries, for there, sooner or later, unless renewed from the south, his whole race must become extinct. Let all wait, then, till he shows what freedom will do for him in the West Indies and Africa before we disrupt society here, and desolate our whole land merely that he may be free. In the mean time, let us pass no laws to fix the race in any one place, but let them continue their migration southward until they go through the United States, if they will, into Mexico and further south, where already they seem to be amalgamating with the other races. And while they are going, we of the North should let them alone. We cannot mend their destiny; we can only mar it. They are in the South, and of the South. The five or six millions of our white brothers there are more intimately connected with them, and more deeply interested in them, than we are. Let us, I repeat, leave them to those among whom they dwell, trusting to their patriotism, their humanity, their wisdom, their christianity, to deal kindly and justly with them, until the common Father of us all shall work out his own great and good purposes with us and with them.

We have already seen the utter inutility of laws fixing the bounds of slavery. This country was agitated far and wide on the introduction of Missouri into the Union. The attempt was then made to prescribe the limits of slavery; and fanatics looked upon the reception of that State into the Union with slavery as aiding the extension of that institution. Yet what are the facts in relation to Missouri now? Why, if white laborers continue to flow into her as they have been doing recently, it will not be many years before slavery will cease to exist there, as it already has, by these same natural laws, quietly and peaceably ceased in all the old northern States. I mention the case of Missouri, to show that natural laws are more powerful than Congressional ones. The ordinance of 1787, much as it is respected by anti-slavery advocates, to my mind was of very little importance, and of the same little consequence do I consider the Missouri compromise. If slaves had been allowed to go into the Northwestern Territory, or north of 36° 30' in that of Louisiana, by law, few would ever have been taken there; and those who formed the State Governments would have excluded them, or if they had not, they would soon have gone out from the same causes that have taken them out of the old northern States. The impossibility of fixing slavery by law upon any part of this country whose climate is such that white labor can be readily obtained and successfully brought into competition with it, has been shown, north and west, to be an absurdity. Why has it disappeared from the more northern States, or why is it decreasing, positively or comparatively, in Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia? Because this law of God—their climate—is more powerful than the laws of man. Even in

the higher and more healthy parts of the southern States, the number of slaves is small, compared with the lower, warmer, and more unhealthy parts of them. When the superior race have the advantage of climate, the inferior race, if not forced to remain by human laws, will disappear.

On the other hand, were we to enact a thousand laws to drive or keep the negroes out of those parts of the southern States to which I have alluded as the cotton, rice, and sugar-growing portions, whose climate is death to any white man from the North who attempts to labor on its fields, they would not induce the white laborers of the North to go there. He would be their worst enemy who would attempt it. They would but go to their graves. Some years since, a large number of Irishmen were taken to New Orleans to dig a canal near that city; the consequence was, that they nearly all died, and that very soon. A number of German laborers were induced to go to the southern part of Texas. I am told by a gentleman on this floor that, after suffering with diseases the most painful, they have nearly all died. We all know how destructive of life the whole South is to northern men, ever when not exposed to the sun. What would it be if they were obliged to labor day after day under its scorching beams? No laws could impel them to do it; and if we had prohibited slavery in Louisiana, Mississippi, or Alabama before they were States, and enough white men had gone there to form a State, they would either have become depopulated, or, from the law of necessity, have adopted slavery afterwards. Does any man doubt this? Then why should we agitate this whole country time and again, and alienate one portion of its people from another, to accomplish what is impracticable and pernicious.

If slaves were to be carried to California, or the higher part of New Mexico, the pressure of the whites would soon drive them out of it. But no man, north or south, that I have ever conversed with, believes they will ever be carried there. The certainty that slaves will be prohibited by them when formed into States, will prevent any one from taking slaves there, if so disposed. Then, I am asked, why not prohibit them by law? For a very good reason—it is obnoxious to a large number of our brethren; it places them, our equals under our Constitution, in the position of our inferiors; and, for one, I am not willing to fix upon them this mark of degradation. We are told by high authority, that "when one member suffers all the members suffer with it," and that "if one member be honored all the members rejoice with it." Let us, then, rejoice in doing justice and honor to all the members of this great Union of ours, rather than in dishonoring any of them.

I am opposed to it, moreover, because, though it can do no good, it may do much harm, by depriving one-half of the people of the States of their equal rights with the other—an equal participation in the common property of the Union, won equally by their services, sufferings, and bravery, consecrated equally with their blood, and to be paid for equally by them from their common treasury. I am opposed to it, because it makes invidious distinctions among equals, by attempting to fix a stigma upon the institutions of one-half of the States, which, at the formation of our Union, were common to them all. But above all, I am opposed to it, because it is in violation

of the spirit, if not of the letter of the Constitution, which spreads its protecting ægis over the property of the citizens of all the States alike when beyond the jurisdiction of the State—alike over the slaves of the South, as over the ships of the North when wrecked on a foreign shore, and which should make no distinctions in its protection of these same ships or slaves when found in the waters or on the land of the common territory of all the States, until those who inhabit that territory shall provide a government and laws for their own protection.

But it is said by some, the people of the South would never oppose the prohibition, if only the mere abstract right were involved. Whoever reasons thus, must think they are degenerate sons of their sires of the Revolution, or must have forgotten that those sires pledged their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" for an abstract right, and nobly redeemed the pledge on many a battle-field. We of the North, and particularly they of Massachusetts, should remember, too, that it was more for wrongs inflicted on the North than the South that they fought and bled.

If the people of the South asked any special legislation for their benefit, I should be as much opposed to it as I am to special legislation against them. All the rights they have under the Constitution, every man in the Union ought to allow

them to enjoy in peace and safety; and these are all they demand. They do not ask us to establish slavery anywhere. They do not propose to exclude any free man, woman, or child, in the northern States, or in any other part of the world, from going into these Territories, and taking with them all they possess, and, when there, being secured in its full enjoyment. They have not asked to be allowed to take their slaves there—they have asked nothing for their slaves, or for slavery, at any time, in this District, in the States, or in the Territories. They ask nothing but to be let alone. They do not want the word "slaves," or "slavery," to be heard in the debates of this Hall, or to be found upon your statute-books. Surely it is hard, very hard, they cannot enjoy this small privilege—nay, this sacred right—the right of our brotherhood, the right of the Constitution—in peace.

Thus far I have voted for every proposition to settle this vexed question, and to enable the people of those territories to form governments, confident that if we leave them unrestricted, they will do what is best. My object, in all that I have said or done on this subject, has been to allay this sectional war, which has already done much to alienate the affections of one part of our country from another, and to restore a better feeling; and while I shall remain here, I intend to pursue the same course to the end.









WERT  
BOOKBINDING  
Granville, Pa.  
Jan. - Feb. 1988  
We do Quality Binding

